

15708

REMARKS

Claim 12 is amended and Claim 13 is cancelled. Claims 1-12 and 14-20, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

In the Office Action dated October 17, 2003, the Examiner rejected Claims 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent No. 5,984,490 issued to Leen. The Examiner rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Leen patent in view of the U.S. Patent No. 5,386,358 issued to Hillinger. The Examiner objected to Claim 13 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but stated that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants amended Claim 12 to include the subject matter of Claim 13 and cancelled Claim 13. In view of the Examiner's comments, Applicants believe that amended Claims 12, 14 and 15 are allowable.

Applicants appreciate the allowance of Claims 1-11 and 16-20.

The Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure. According to the Examiner, the other references of record all disclose light assemblies which are similar to Applicants' invention. The Examiner cited: the U.S. Patent No. 4,463,413 issued to Shirley; the U.S. Patent No. 5,243,507 issued to Atkins et al.; the U.S. Patent No. 5,195,823 issued to Sidabras; and the U.S. Patent No. 6,554,459 issued to Yu et al. Applicants have reviewed these references and found them to be no more pertinent than the prior art relied upon by the Examiner in his rejections.

In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicants believe that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.